



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,460	03/26/2004	Regina I. Estkowski	RTN-208PUS	1782
33164	7590	02/12/2008		
RAYTHEON COMPANY C/O DALY, CROWLEY, MOFFORD & DURKEE, LLP 354A TURNPIKE STREET SUITE 301A CANTON, MA 02021			EXAMINER BEHNCKE, CHRISTINE M	
			ART UNIT 3661	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/12/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/811,460

Applicant(s)

ESTKOWSKI ET AL.

Examiner

CHRISTINE M. BEHNCKE

Art Unit

3661

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) CHRISTINE M. BEHNCKE.(3) Anthony Moosey (Reg. No. 55,773).(2) Thomas Black.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 07 February 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: Independent claim 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Urmson in view of Kindel.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The interpretation of the claim language as applied to reference Urmson, specifically the claim limitation of "plurality of deterministic tree extension rules" was discussed. The Kindel reference was discussed as applied to the claim limitation "predetermined trajectory path constraints". The Examiner explained the interpretation of Kindel's described dynamic constraints reads on the reasonably broad interpretation of deterministic rules.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Thomas G. Black/ SPE 3661

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required